

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 96-1916**

---

CLARK C. KIRKLAND, SR.; SHARON S. KIRKLAND,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

RUSSELL CHASTAIN, Individually, d/b/a Kirby of Simpsonville, South Carolina; LISA CHASTAIN, Individually, d/b/a Kirby of Simpsonville, South Carolina; HARRY BOWEN, Individually d/b/a Tri State Kirby, Franklin, North Carolina; SCOTT FETZER CORPORATION, d/b/a Kirby Company USA, Westlake, Ohio; RONNIE RICHARDS, Individually; RALPH ALVERSON, Individually; DAVID RICE, Individually; TOWN OF WOODRUFF, SOUTH CAROLINA; J. CARLISLE OXNER, JR., Individually; CHET MORRIS, Individually; JERRY COOPER, Individually; NANCY SKINNER, Individually; PHOEBE WADDELL, Individually; WOODRUFF STATE BANK SHARES, d/b/a Woodruff State Bank; DOUGLAS RICHARDSON, Individually; GEORGE GREEN, Individually; COUNTY OF LAURENS, SOUTH CAROLINA; HAROLD LEE, Individually; COUNTY OF GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA; LAURENS COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA, SHERIFF AND SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; GREENVILLE COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA, SHERIFF AND SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (CA-95-3370-6-3AK)

---

Submitted: December 19, 1996

Decided: January 9, 1996

---



---

Before ERVIN and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Clark C. Kirkland, Sr., Sharon S. Kirkland, Appellants Pro Se. Eddie R. Harbin, Greenville, South Carolina; Ronald Keith Wray, II, GIBBES, GALLIVAN, WHITE & BOYD, P.A., Greenville, South Carolina; William Stevens Brown, V, NELSON, MULLINS, RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, Greenville, South Carolina; Edwin Calhoun Haskell, III, SMITH & HASKELL, Spartanburg, South Carolina; James John Raman, Spartanburg, South Carolina; Oscar William Bannister, Jr., David Garrison Hill, HILL, WYATT & BANNISTER, L.L.P, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellants appeal the district court's order denying relief on their 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1994) and 42 U.S.C. § 1985 (1994) complaints, and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Appellants' state law claims. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Kirkland v. Chastain, No. CA-95-3370-6-3AK (D.S.C. May 20, 1996). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED